MORMONISM.

Last Day of the Great Discussion on Polygamy.

Both Parties Satisfied Neither Convinced.

The Mathematical Proof of the Authority for Polygamy.

Remarkable Prayer by a Saint at the Close of the Discussion.

Ten Thousand Persons in the Great Tabernacle.

SAUF LAKE CITY, August 14, 1870. The great debate between Professor Orson Pratt Rev. Dr. J. P. Newman on the question "Does the Bible Sanction Polygamy?" was closed this (Sunday) afternoon. It was commenced on Friday last, and continued on three successive days. The interest, which had gradually heightened from the first, reached its culminating point this afternoon. The interior of the Tabernacle presented a speciacle which has seldom been surpassed. It is I have never seen an assembly in the Tabernacle manifest so much absorbing interest. The usual religious services of the Mormons are generally cold and formal; but to-day every countenance was aglow, for almost every individual was personally interested in the great discussion. It was an event in the history of the Mormons to have a distinguished Christian minister, whose words are but the echo of the sentiment of the nation, come to the great stronghold of polygamy and pronounce the sand people. Brigham Young and his counsellors, the aposties, the bishops and the eiders sat in their into their ears the Divine denunciation of their sys tem. More than half the audience was composed of women, and it was evident that most of them were in sympathy with the Doctor during the whole of the discussion, when he pointed out from his Scriptural standpoint that monogamy is the fundamental and the only form of marriage which, instituted by God himself in Eden, approved by all the prophets and glorised by Christ and His aposties, has ever had the Almighty's smile and sanction. At the close of the debate a desperate effort was made in the closing prayer by one of the apostles to counteract the influence of Dr. Newman's arguments by, not in reality a prayer to the Lord, but an argument to the people in favor of polygamy. The proceedings this afternoon were opened by the choir singing the 187th hymn in the Mormon Hymn Book, com-

Hosannah to the great Messiah, The long expected Saviour King! He'il come and cleanse the earth by fire, And gather scattered Israel in.

Prayer was then offered by the Rev. Dr. Sunderland, after which the choir sang the Forty-first hymn, eginning:-

Spirit of Faith come down,
Reveal the things of God,
And make us to the Godiead known,
And witness with the blood.

Elder George Q. Cannon, one of the Twelve Aposties, at the request of Judge Snow, one of the um-pires, read a few of the conditions agreed upon for regulating the discussion, in order that persons in the audience who had not been present on the previous days might understand them. He also stated that, in order to allow the speakers to finish their concluding sentences, in case such were not completed when their time was up, one minute more would be allowed them for that purpose.

CONCLUDING ARGUMENT OF PROFESSOR PRATT. Professor Pratt then rose and spoke as follows:-LADIES AND GENTLEMEN-We have assembled Ourselves in this vast congregation, in the third session of our discussion upon a very important institution of the Bible. The question, as you have already heard, is, "Does the Bible Sanction Polygamy?" Many arguments have been adduced, both on the side of the affirmative and also on the side of the negative of this question. This afternoon one hour is allotted to me in the discussion to bring forth still further evidences, which will close the debate so far as the affirmative is concerned; then to be fol-

close the discussion. Polygamy is a question, or, in other words, an in-I have already shown, by Divine authority, established by law, by command: and hence, of course, must be sanctioned by the great Divine law giver whose words are recorded in the Bible. There is one particular item which I wish to bring forth in the commencement of my remarks this afternoon. Yesterday I was challenged by the Rev. Dr. Newman to bring forth any evidences whatever to prove that there were more than two polygamists' families in all Israel during the time of their socourn in the gentleman to say. I shall now proceed to bring forth the proof. The statistics of Israel in the days years old (Numbers 1,46) 603,550. This will be found in the passage to which I have referred. wards of the male population isput down at 603,550 souls. It was admitted yesterday afternoon that Mr. Newman's assertion—2,500,000. I shall also take the position that the females among Israel were far tion of them that were over twenty years of age. For this reason I assume this:-From the birth of Moses down to the time that Israel were numbered some eighty years had elansed. The destruction of the male children had commenced before the birth of Moses; how many years before that I know not. The order of King Pharaoh was to destroy all the male children by drowning them. All the people of his realm were commanded to see that they were destroyed and thrown into the river Nile. How long a period this great destruction continued is unknown; but if we suppose that one male child to every 250 persons was destroyed every year it would amount to the number of 10,000 persons destroyed-I mean infant males. This would soon begin to tell in regard to the difference in the number of males and females. Ten thousand each year would only be one male child to each 250 persons. How many would this make in eighty years?—Moses then being eighty years of age. It would amount to 800,000 females above that of males. But I do not wish to take advantage in this argument by assuming too high a number. We will shift the difference and say it was one-half that number. Instead of 800,000 we will say 400,000 more females than males, owing to the great destruction that was ordered among them. This would be one male destroyed each year out of every 500 persons. The females then over twenty years of age would be 603,550, plus or added to 400,000 supplus women, making in

all 1,003,500 females over twenty years of age. The children, therefore, under twenty years to make up the 2,500,000, would be 892,000, the total population of Israel being laid down at 2,500,000 people. Now, then, for the number of families constituting this population. The families having first born males over one month old (Numbers Ill., 43) numbered 22,273. Armittes having no male children over one month old supposed to be in the ratio of three to one. The ratio might, perhaps, be far different from this; but judging from what we see here in our own country and among different nations, there may have been some families with only females, some families without any children at all, some families where children were less than a month old; but if we take them as three to one the

ing no arst born males. Add these to the 22,273 with first born males, and we have the sum total of 12.697 families in Israel. Now, in order to favor the monogamists' argument, and give them all the

advantage possible, we will still add to this numbe in order to make it round numbers. Instead of calling it 29,697 families we will add 505 families more, making thirty thousand families in all. Now then we come to another species of calculation founded on this data. Divide 2,500,000 persons by founded on this data. Davide 2,500,000 persons by 22,273 first born males, and we find one first born male to every 112 persons. What a large family for a monogamist! But divide 2,500,000 persons by 30,000 families and the quotient gives eighty-three persons in a family! Supposing these families to be monogamic, after deducting husband and wife we have the very respectable number of eighty-one children to each monogamic wife. And if assume the number of mates and females to be exactly equal, making no allowance for the destruction of the male miants, we shall then have to increase the number of enlidren under twenty years of age so as to keep good the number of 2,500,003. This would still make eighty-one children on an average in each of the 30,000 monogamic families. Now we come to examine the subject in rezard to polygamic households, so as to reduce the number that each woman would have. If we suppose the average number of wives to be seven—the average number recollect—there may be many that have no wife at alt; there may be many that have no wife at alt; there may be many monogamic families; and then there may be many polygamic having from one wife up to thirty or forty. But we will average them, the 30,000 families, we will average them, the 30,000 families, we will average them, the of the 20,000 polygamic wives and a,000 husbands to seven wives, and seventy-five children, making eighty-three in a family. In the polygamic household this would give an average of over ten children to each of the 20,000 polygamic wives and 3,000 husbands. When we take the 30,000 married men from the 1,003,550 females over twenty years old. This would be enough to supply all the unmarried men it larged. If we deduct 210,000 married women from the 1,003,550 females over twenty years old. This would be enough to supply all the unmarried men with one wife each, leaving sall a balance of 220,000 unmarried females to two old makes or enter hato polygamic households. The law guaranteeing the rights of the first born mote children i

and be consistent? Is it reasonable, is it consistent to suppose that these households could have been monogamic in their nature? By no means; it cannot be so. I presume that my friend, notwithstanding his great desire and carnesiness to overthrow polygamy—I presume that he will not have the conscience to say to this people that one wife can bring forth eighty-one children in a household. If they cannot, and we can depend upon these numbers, these biblical statistics, then let Mr. Newman, who assumes that the males and females were equal, show how these great and wonderful households could be produced among Israel if there were only two polygamic families in their midst. It requires something more powerful than that medicinal herb called mandrakes to which Mr. Newman reders in his rejoinder to my reply in the New York (Enald). (Laughter.) I think there are no mandrakes at the present day that would accompilish such wonders as that, (Laughter.)

that. (Laughter.)
Having then established that Israel was a poly-Having then established that Israel was a polygamic nation, remember that when God gives have slie gives them to a polygamic nation, the monogamic families being the exception, and few of them compared to the polygamic. They were founded in the days of israel, that is, of Jacob. He commenced the work and it was continued in polygamy until they became very, numerous, very great and powerful, while here and there might be found a monogamic manify with only one wife. Now, if God gave laws to a people of these mixed forms of marriage in the wilderness of course He would adapt it is laws to both classes of families. He would not shut out the isolated instance that could be picked up here and there of a man having but one wife, but he would adapt his law to the condition of the monogamic and polygamic forms of marriage throughout all Israel.

But the reverend gentleman says in regard to

when the monogamic and polygamic forms of marriage throughout an Israel.

But the reverend gentleman says in regard to laws given for the regulation of the institution, that they bear upon their face its condemnation, and refers to the laws that have been passed in Paris to regulate the social evit, also the excise laws passed in our country to regulate fintemperance, and that these laws of regulation seem to be condemnatory, as he has expressed it positively to be condemnatory of these crames. Admit it. When the Parisians have passed laws to regulate the social evit they have denounced it as a crime. When the inhabitants of this country have passed laws to regulate intemperance they have denounced it as a crime. When the inhabitants of this country have passed laws to regulate intemperance they have denounced it as a crime, and when God's laws are given, or even laws enacted by human legislation, they generally denounce the crime and attach penalties thereanto. When laws were given against murder the penalty was that the murderer should die. When laws were given to punish the thief and the blasphemer and the Sabbath breaker we find that they were laws of death. When the adulterer was punished to was to be by stoning him to death. God then gave laws to regulate those things in Israel. But because God has regulated many of these great and aboundance crimes by law, has he not right to regulate that which is numoral? For instance, God instituted the law of circumersion and he gave laws regulating it; shall we therefore say, according to the logic of the gentleman, that circumersion was condemned by the law of God? Why, that would be his logic. That would be the natural conclusion, according to the gentleman's logic. Again, when God lastituted the passbe the natural conclusion, according to the gentle-man's logic. Again, when God instituted the pas-over he gave laws how they should conduct the passover; does that condema the passover as being tumoral because it was regulated by they

gamy is condemned by the law of God because it is thus regulated? That kind of logic with never do. We now come, then, to that passage that was so often referred to in the gentieman's reply yesterday afternoon. I was very grad to have the gentieman refer to this passage. The law, according to king James' translation, as we all heard yesterday afternoon, reads ike this:—"Nether shalt thou take a wife to her sister to vex her," &c. That was the law according to King James' translation. My friend, together with Dr. Dwight, Dr. Edwards and several other celebrated commentators, disagree with that interpretation; and somebody (who it was I know not) has inserted in the margin, "Neither shalt thou take one wife to another"—in the margin, recollect, and not in the text. It is argued that the interpretation in the margin must be correct, while king dames' translators must have been mistaken. Now, recollect that the great commentators that have thus aftered king James' translation were monogamists. So were the translators of the Bible. They were all monogamists in regard to the true translation of this passage. It has been original Hebrew signifies something intend that the original Hebrew signifies something intend that the original Hebrew signifies something herally different from that which is contained in King James' translation. These are first words, as will be found in his first sermon, or his sermon published at Washington, in the District of Columbia, upon this same thing:—"But in verse eighteen the law against polygamy is given—'Neither shalt thou take a wife to her sister,' or, as the marginal reaching is, 'Thou shalt not take one wife to another,' and this rendering is sustained by Cookson, Bishop Jewell, Dr. Edwards and Dr. Edwards in words which were translated 'a wife to her sister,' are found in the Hebrew out eight thuss. Now, I have not been favored with wife to another? and this rendering is sustained by Cookson, Histop Jeweil, Dr. Edwards and Dr. Dwight," four eminent monogamists. According to Dr. Edwards the words which were translated "a wife to her sister" are found in the Hebrew but eight times. Now, I have not been favored with these authorities; I have not heen favored with these authorities; I have not heen favored with these authorities; I have not heen favored with these authorities; I have not hee favored with these authorities; I have not hee eight places where these mountain wilds it is difficult to get books. "In each of the eight places where these words are found, "they refer to manimate objects," that is, in each of the eight places where these words are found. I have searched them out in the Hebrew, and can refer you to the chapter and verse where the eight places where force of the cound, and I don't know how many more; but it is sail by the Rev. Dr. Newman that they are only found eight times—reading again from Dr. Newman—"he each passage they refer to inanimate objects, such as the wings of the cherubim, tenens, mortices, &c., and signify coupling together one to another." "he each place of the charles of another." "I have the wings of the cherubim, tenens, mortices, &c., and signify coupling together one to another." "how to another." "I have one wife to another." "Forbid it—they denote the exact likeness of one thing to another."—that is all true; we admit that—"and here, therefore, as the margin expresses it, forbid the taking of one wife to another." "Forbid it—this is what we deny; and we have the liberty, according to the articles of agreement before us, of going to the original Hebrew. And what are the Hebrew words that are used? Veishath et-ahotah, to tikkah—"Neither shall thou take a wife to her sister," that is the literal translation of that passage, Veishah being translated "wife," I knap shares translated "sister." But thou the passage with the grain and take." Have they given a literal translation? Under the only rendering. W

render it "another?" or, on the other hand, if we render it "one" we have no right to give it another translation and use the word "wife," as they have in the imargia. Now, that word "wife," is they have the in the margia to so, that word "wife," is manufactured. It is not in the original; it cannot be found there. I do not know what the ideas of Dr. Dwight and Dr. Edwards and the other learned commentators were in manufacturing the word "wife," when there was no original word that signified it, only that they were monogamists, and they were very fearnot that they could not find any law to condemn polygamy, and c-neiuded to manufacture the word "wife" and sitck it into the margin. "But," says one, "are not these in the eight passages referred to by Dr. Edwards translated 'one to another?" Yes. Why, then, should thin be an exception here? Why should King James' translation give the literal translation of "wife," and "sitter," instead of "one to another?" Why should there be an exception? Because they saw a necessity for it. There is this difference, in all the passages—the seven other passages where these words occur ishate el ahot-ah—wherever these occur we find there is a noun preceding them—something to be coupled to either—a noun in the nominative case, to be joined together. For instance, let me refer you to the passages themestees so that you can unit them up. Exodus xxvi, 3, contains ishah el ahot-ah in two places, signifying the coupling together, "one to another." The noun in the nominative case, then, in these instances, means curtains and loops. Next, go to Ezekiel i., 9, 11, 23, and you will find that these third chapter of the king chapter, and the ren we have the loops of the curtains coupled together, joined together, "one to another." The noun in the nominative case, then, in these instances, means curtains and loops. Next, go to Ezekiel i., 9, 11, 23, and you will find that these third chapter of Ezekiel and the thirteenth verse, "and the wings of the cherubin one to another." The noun is the sa "another?" I am willing to admit that the words agree in the seven other passages I he ferred to. And what will be the consequence of the admission? The consequence will be, that if they had a right to manufacture a word when there was no original to sustain them in that manufacture. I have the same right to manufacture another word, if it is needful to do it, and let it read thus:—"Neither shalt thou take one sister to another to vex her during her lifetime." And that is really the true rendering, and that agrees with King james's rendering, showing that it was a part and portion of the law of consanguinity that is contained in a great number of the preceding verses about the marriage between blood relations:—"Neither shalt thou take one sister to another to vex her during her lifetime." Now that accords, you know, with the Idea of translating 15hah "one," and ahot "another." I am willing to admit it. "But then," says one, "you have to manufacture the word "sister," and if we have have no right to manufacture the word "wife" you have no right on your part to manufacture the word "sister." Very well. Let us see it we can get a word from the original by this translation. Yes, yes. There is something now that will step in to supply the place when we translate it according to the real meaning. What is that? The personal pronoun "her?"—"Neither shalt thou take a wife to her sister." Where is that personal pronoun found in the original? It is a suffix attached to the Hebrew word for sister. It reads "alto-sah," signifying "her sister." Now we all know what a pronoun means; it means something that is used in the stead of a noun. Now supposing we supply the noun that this word represents, then it will read thus:—"Neither shalt thou take a sister's sister to vex her during her lifetime"—when we come to restore the noun in place of the pronoun represented by the Hebrew letters ah attached as a sualix to the noun dard, making it about ack. A sister's sister to vex her during her lifetime"—when we come to restore the noun try? It was blood relations that did this. Among blood relations there was an enmity existing. Who was it that siew the seven sons of Gideon upon one stone? It was one of their own brothers who have also also their own brothers who have an entire the stone of their own brothers who have and caused him, with all his wives, except ten concubines, to diee out of Jerusalem? It was his blood relation, his son Absalom. Who was it that quarrelled in the family of Jacob? Did Lean quarrel with Bilhah? Not a word of quarrelling. Did she quarrel with Zipah? No such thing in the record. Bid Rachel quarrel with either of the two nandmaids? Not a word concerning the matter; but the quarrel seemed to exist between the two blood relations, Rachel and Lean; and the bord seeing this probably gave that commandment in that day in order to put a stop to the marriage of blood relations, between sister and sister.

Now, then, having effectually answered an ap-

Now, then, having effectually answered an appeal to the original, I will defy not only the learned gentleman, but all the world of Hebrew scholars, to find any world whatsoever in the original to be find any world whatsoever in the original to be find any world whatsoever in the original to be find any world whatsoever in the original to be find any world whatsoever in the original to have a learned in the margin. What becomes of it, then? Why, it takes its original position, and because there is no noun preceding the world "one to another," as there is in the other seven passages where these world occur where these words occur—
One of Mr. Pratt's friends seeing that he was

lone of Mr. Pratts thends seeing that he was likely to exhaust all his time in his exeges of the Hebrew, here whispered into his ear.]

Mr. PRATT—I am informed that I have only fifteen minutes left. I was not aware that I had spoken a quarter of that time. I shari have to leave this subject and go on to another.

enarter of that time. I shall have to leave this subject and go on to another.

The next subject to which I will call your attention very priefly is in regard to the unlimited nature of the command which was given in the various passages which I have referred to in my first remarks. If a man shall entice a maid; if a man shall commit rape; if a man shall do this, that or the other thing, will any one pretend to sty that a married person is not a man? If a married person is a man, then it proves that the law is general, and it is the part of my learned opponent to prove that it is not general. I am not obliged to alter a passage to prove something that is not asserted. Let him prove that it is finited. Moreover, the passage was given as the foundation and principal law by which all the other passages were to be tried. The passage stand together, unless there is something else to be found.

Perhaps we may near in the answer to my remarks

Perhaps we may near in the answer to my remarks remaps we may new in the answer to my remarks the passage of Scripture referred to that the future King of israel should not mustiply wives to himself. That was a law. Now the word multiply, it is argued by a great many opposed to polygainy, means twice one is two; that means multiply! and consequently the future of israel must not mustiply two wives. But right in the same connection is a command that he shall not multiply more its hostification. quently the inture of israel must not multiply two wives. But right in the same connection is a command that he shall not multiply norses to himself. Twice one horse is two norses. Does this mean that the future kings of Israel must only have one horser Why, according to that logic and interpretation it would mean that. But the very idea is relicutions. It shows very plainly that the future kings of Israel shall not multiply them in excess, either horses or wives. We have no time to dwell upon that any longer. that any longer.
We will now refer to the case of Ruth and Boaz.

that any iongor.

We will now refer to the case of Ruth and Boaz. Boaz represented nimself as not being the nearest kin. There was another him that was still nearer, and he happened to be the brother of Boaz. He probably was the oldest, and consequently it was his right. Josephus tells as, according to the learned gentleman, that the person who was of nearest kin, probably the oldest brother, was a married man. Supposing we admit it, did not his brother know it? Way, then, should be represent him as being the nearest of kin and that he had the right before him? And even this other brother acknowledges his right. A married man acknowledging his right. A married man acknowledging his right. There is the contained in the had the right before him? And even this other brother acknowledges his right. A married man acknowledging his right, to take her, but I am afraid of marrying my inheritance. Go thou and take my right. Thave a right to take her, but I am afraid of marrying my inheritance. Go thou and take my right. There are not any him the assistance of Josephus to carry us right, proves that married men were obliged to comply with the law. We have no further time to examine that passage. We shall now examine the passage that is contained in Mathew in regard to divorce, and also in Malachi. For the Lord, by the mouth of Malachi, informed us that the Lord hateta him who putteth away the wife of his youth, and gives the reason why the wife should not be put away. Not a word said about polygamy. But there is a certain reason given in that passage to show that the wife must not be put away; and what is it? That 'm the beginning God created one." What for? In order that adam might not be alone, wichout any helpmet, without the possible power of mcrease, the Lord, therefore, made one in order that he might begin the work. And that one was never to be divorced. It was bone of his bone and ficsh of his desn, and coule not be put away; and consequently it was a condemnation of those who underrook in those days to divorce t

fiesh of his fiesh, and could not be put away; and consequently it was a condemnation of those who underrook in those days to divorce their wives.

Come to Matthew. Jesus there gives a law respecting divorce; that they should not put away their wives for any other cause than that of formication and take another; for if they did they would commit adultery. Now, Jesus says, in the fifth chapter of Matthew, that the putting away of the wife causes her to commit adultery. Then the husband is a confederate, and if he causes his wife to commit adultery as is gually himself, the same as a man that assists another in murder. Now, has the adulterer any right to take another? No. Has he a right to take even one wife? No; he has no right. Why? Because his right is to be stoned to death; his right is to be punished with death for his adultery. Consequently, if the adulter has no right to even his used he certainly has no rightly the law of God to a wife. It may be argued that the crime is not in putting away, but it is in taking another. I argue that it is in ooth together—one crime added to another. But thus has no application, then, to a man who keeps his wife, retains her and at the same time takes another. Now the law of God that I have referred to, in Leviticus xviii. It, shows that polygany was in existence; but it was required by this law to be kept within the circe of those who were not blood relations.

"Duty of marriage"—I will refer to that; serry that i have not more time. The words "duty of marriage" occurring in the passage, "If a man shall take another wife," &c., respecting the first he says. "Her food and her raiment and her duty of marriage re shall not doublish." Now what does thas mean, "the duty of marriage." It is something more than

betrothal. It is something snowing that the individual that had been previously betrothed is actually in the state of marriage, and the words "duty of marriage" clearly express it. But what is the meaning of the individual words? They don't mean dwelling or habitation or refuge, as asserted in the New York Heraal. by Mr. Newman. Foder passages are quoted by him, and I have examined all four of the passages and the word does not occur in either of them. In one place it is a word translated in Denteronomy as "refuge," and in the lotth Pealin it is translated "den," and in Jeremah it is translated "habitation," and in Amos it is translated by a word that represents the same thing. But the original word occurs once in the libite, as I can prove by the lexicon that was published by Mr. Glibs, A. Mr. Professor of Sacred Literature in the theological institution of Yale College. Go and read what he says upon the subject, and he will tell you, upon page 160 of this lexicon, that the "duty of marriage" means cohabitation; her food and raiment and the duty of cohabitation he shull not diminish What? An unmarried woman a betrothed woman? God command an undiminished cohabitation with one not married? Can any one believe this for a moment? By no means. The person was previously married, and we have the acknowledgment by Mr. Newman that the second person that was taken is acknowledged as the true wife, and we have the exhapted from the state I have a moment's timeleft. Refer to Hosea. I want all of you when you go home to read the second chapter of Hosea, and you will find that instead of Hosea having divorced his arst whe of whoredome before taking the actulities, and to spoak to them and tell them what he the Lord will do; that he will not acknowledge them as wives—not acknowledge them in that capacity; the word of the Lord concerning Israel, of which these two wives should represent their whoredom. Inter abomination and their wickelness. That is all the time we have lett for that passage.

Having discussed the subject so

SOF PRACES NOT MAIN 1988 STORE AND CONCLUDING ARGUMENT OF DR. NEWMAN.

Dr. Newman then came forward and spoke as follows:—

RESPECTED UMPIRES, LADIES AND GENTLEMEN—
I had heard prior to my coming to your city that my distinguished opponent was eminent in mathematics, and certainly his display to-day confirms that reputation. Unfortunately, however, he is incorrect in his statements. First, he assumes that the slaying of the male children of the hebrews was continued through eighty years. He has failed to produce the proofs to-day. This was his starting point. He assumes it. Where is the proof, either in the Bible or in Josephus? And until he can prove that the destruction of the male children went on for eighty years, then I say that his argument has no more foundation than a vision. Then ne makes another blunder. The cos,550 men above twenty years of age mentioned in this case were men to go to war. They were not the total male population of the Jowish nation. And yet my mathematical friend stands here to-day and declares that the whole male population above twenty years of age consisted of 693,560, whereas it is a fact that this number does not include all the males. Then, again, with reference to the 22,273 first born. This does not represent the number of families in Israel at that time, for many of the first born were dead. These are the dunders the gentleman has made to-day; and I challenge him to produce facts to the contrary, and prove that he is not guilty of making these numerical blunders. Hen, he denies the assertion made vesterday that there could not be brought forward more than one or two instances of polygany in the history of Israel from the time the Hebrews left Egypt to the time they entered cannan. Has he disproved that? How has he attempted to disprove it? He has attempted to disprove it? He has attempted to disprove it? He has attempted to speak of the history of the Jews while they were in the wilderness? Ladies and gentlemen, he had none to give; and, therefore, the assertion made yester

then and there, but it is not correct now and here. It is a poor rule that will not work both ways—correct when he wants to quote from the margin, but not correct when I want to quote from the margin. He set me the example, and I followed his illustrates a constant.

rect when he wants to quote from the margin, but not correct when I want to quote from the margin, the set me the example, and I followed his illustrious example.

But now, my friends, supposing that the text means just what he says, namely—"Neither shalt thou take a wife onto her sister to vex her," supposing that is the rendering, and he asserts (and no is a Hebraist) that that is the meaning, I argued yesterday, and produced the proof, that this staw of Moses is not kept by the Morinons—in other words it is violated—here. There are men in your very midst who have married sisters. Where was the gentleman's solemn denunciation of the violation of God's law? Why did he not lit up his voice to vandleate the Divine law? But not a solitary word of disapproval is uitered by him. Yesterday he pronounced a carse—"Garsed is he that conformeth not to the words of this law to do them." Does not the curse rest upon him and upon his people? I gave him the liberity to choose whether this text condemned polygamy, or whether it condemned a man marrying two sisters. He himself took his choice. The two horns of the dilemma are before him. For the sake of saving polygamy he stands up here in the presence of Ahmging tood and his holy angels, and before this intelligent congregation, and admits that in this church, and with this people, God's holy law is set at deflance: What respect, therefore, can we have for the gentleman's argument, drawn from the teachings of Moses, in support of polygam? He refers us to the multiplication of horses. I suppose the King might have one horse or two horses—there is no special rule as to the number of hives—"Neither shall the King multiply wives." God in the beginning gave the first man one wife, and christ and Paul sustained that law as binding upon us. But now suppose that that is not accepted as a law, what then? Why there is no limit to the number of hives. How many shall a man have? Seven? Twenty? Fifty? Sixty? One hundred? Why, they somewhere quote a pssage that "if a man forsaking and tha I say only twenty-live or thirty special recorded cases all told, which polygamists of our day claim in support of their position. I propose to take up half a dozen or so of the most prominent cases, and in so doing I shall divide the time into two periods—before the law and after the law. First I take up before the law and after the law. First I take up Abraham. It is asserted that he was a polygamist. I deny it. There is no proof that Abraham was guilty of polygamy. What are the facts? When he was called by the Almanuty to be the founder of a great nation, then the promise was given to him that he should have a numerous posterity. At that time he was a monogamist; he had but one wife, the noble Sarah. Six years passed and the promise was not falified. Then Sarah, destring to help the Lord to keep His own promise, brought her Egyptian maid Hagar and oftered her as a substitute for herself to Abraham. Mind you. Abraham did not go after Hagar, but Sarah produced her as her substitute. Immediately after the act was performed Sarah discovered her sin, and said, "My wrong be upon thee; I have committed sin, but I did it for thy sake, and therefore the wrong that I have committed be upon thee." And then look at the subsequent facts, By the Divine command this Expytian girl was sent away from the abode of Abraham, was sent away by mutual consent of the husband and the wife, and by the Divine command. It is said that she was promised a numerous posterity, that is,

tion does not justify the connection which Auraham had with this girl. She was sent away by hybranam had with this girl. She was sent away by hybranam had with this girl. She was sent away by hybranam had with this girl. She was sent away hy hybranam had she had she had she had she was continued after had his is the fact in regard to her, that Abraham lived thirty-eight years after the death of Sarah. The energy miraculously given to Abraham is odd for the generation of issae was continued after Sarah's death. To suppose that he took Keturah during the life of Sarah is to do violence to his moral character. But it is said that he sent away the sons of Keturah with presents, during his lifetime, therefore it must have been during the lifetime of Sarah. But he lived thirty-eight years after the death of Sarah, and he sent these sons away eight years before his death, and they were from twenty-live to thirty years old. Therefore this venerable pariaren stands forth as a monogamist and not as a polygamist. (Manifestations of dissent.)

Then we come to the case of Jacob, and what are the facts in regard to him? Broaght up in the sanctity of monogamy, after having robbed his brother of his birth ight, after having field to his old blind inther, then he steals away and goes to Paden Aram, and there he falls in love with Rache; but in his britial bed he finds Rachel's sister, Leah. He did not enter polygamy voluntarily, but he was imposed upon by laban in the darkness of the night. But I hold this to be true that Jacob is nowhere regarded as a saintly man prior to his conversion at the Jabbok. After that conversion then he appears in a saintly character. It is a remarkable fact that Jacob lived 147 years all told, eighty-five of which he lived before he became a polygamist. He lived twenty-two years in polygamy. He lived forty years after he had abandonel polygamy. So that out of 147 years there were only twenty-two years during which he had any connection with polygamy.

during which he had any connection with polygamy.

I wish my friend had referred to the case of Moses. In his sermion on celestral marriage he chims that Moses was a polygamist, and he declares that the leprosy that was sent upon Miriam was a punishment for her interference with the polygamic marriage of Moses. What are the facts? There is no record of a second marriage. Zipporah is the only name given to the wife of Moses. On what, then, is his assertion mate? Simply this:—It is recorded that Moses was content to dweit with Jethro, and he gave Moses Zipporah, his daughter. Josephus spears of two daughters belonging to Jethro, and distinctly says he gave Moses one. In Numbers, xii., 1, it is salt:—'And Miriam and Aaron spoke against Moses, because of the Ethiopian woman whom he had married; for he had married an Ethiopian woman,' Now it is affirmed that two women are here mentioned, whereas the Ethiopian woman whom he had married; for he had married an Ethiopian woman." Now it is affirmed that two women are here mentioned, whereas nothing can be more true than that Zipperan and the Ethiopian woman are one and identical. It is the same person called by different names, bet us see: The father of Zipperan was the priest of Midian, and according to the best authornies Midian and Ethiopia are identical terms, and apply to that portion of Arabia where Jethro livel. So the appellation Midian, Ethiopia and Arabia are applied to the Arabian peninsula. (See Appleton's American Enerchpredia.) There Moses stands out, Moses, the Jewish 'awgiver, stands forth as a monogamist, having but one wife. Sorely the founder of a polygamic nation, as these gendemen claim, the revealer of the polygamic law, as nere asserted, surely he should have set the example. He should have had a dozen or a hundred wives. But the son of Jochebed, who was a monogamist, stands forth as a burning reproof of polygamists in all generations.

Now we come to Gideon; and what about this man? An angel appeared to him, that is true. But if the practice of polygamy by Gideon is also a law. If there is silence in the Bible touching the polygamy of Giteon, there is also silence in the Bible touching his idolary, and if the one is sanctioned so also is the other.

I wish my friend had brought up the case of Hannah, the wice of Elkanah. I can prove to a demonstration that Hannah was the first wice of Elkanah.

oead. These are tase immers the gentleman has been controlled the contrary, and it challenge him to produce facts to the contrary, and it the one it is anothered so also is not offered that of the contrary, and the control of the c acter of his birth. I supposed the gentleman on this occasion would have referred to the law of bastardy and have said that if my doctrine be true then Solomon and others were bastards. We could have wished that he had produced that point. He did declare in this temple not long since the law touching bastardy—that a bastard should be branded with inflamy to the teath generation. But it is plain that he has misunderstood the law respecting bastards as contained in Deuteronomy XXIII., 2. It is evident from history that the term has not always been the same. With us a bastard is one born out of wedlock—that is, monogramonic matrimony. At Athens, in the days of Pericles, in the fifth century before Christ, all were declared bastards who were not children of native Athensans. We here assert to day that the gentleman cannot bring forward a law from the book of Jewish laws to prove that a child born of a Jew and Jewess, whether married or not, was the book of Jewish laws to prove that a child born of a Jew and Jewess, whether married or not, was a bastard. The only child recognized as a bastard by Jewish law was a child born of a Jew and a pagan woman. Therefore the objection falls to the ground, and Solomon and others, who were not to biame for the character of their birth, are exonerated.

ground, and Solomon and others, who were not to brame for the character of their birth, are exonerated.

The geometrical progression of evil in this system of polygamy is seen in the first three kings of Israel—Sant, David, Solomon. Sant had a wife and a concubine, two women; David had ten, Solomon a thousand, and it broke the kingdom asunder—God says it—for that very cause. Solomon had multiplied his wives to such an extent that they had not only led him astray from God into idolatry, but the very costlines of his harem was a burden upon the people too heavy for them to bear. I said the other day that polygamy might do for kings and priests, for nabobs, but would not do for poor men. It costs too much, and the people are taxed too much to support the harem. (Sensation) Anly orbiring forward these few cases of polygamy. Name them, if you piease, Lamech, the murderer; Jacob, who deceived his old bland father and robbed his brother of his birthright; David, was seduced another man's wife and marbared that man by putting him in front of the battle, and Solomon, who turned to be an idolator. These are some of the polygamiss. But now let me call the roll of honor. There were Adam and Enoch, and Noah, and Abraham and Isaac and Moses, and Aaron, and Joshua, and Joseph, and Samuel, and all the prophets, and all the kings, and all the prophets, and all the kings, and all the prophets were polygamists. I assert to the contrary, and these great and eminent men waom I have just menuoaed as belonging to the roll of honor were monog amists.

Yesterday the gentieman gave me three challenges. He challenged me to show that the New Testament condemns polygamy. I new proceed to do it. I

memonas ans belonging to the roll of honor were monog amists.

Yesterday the gentleman gave me three challenges, He challenged me to show that the New Testament condemns polygamy. I new proceed to do it. I quote Fami's words, I Corimhans vil., 2 and 4—"Nevertheless to avoid fornication let every man have his own wife, and let every woman have her own husband," "The wife hath not power of her own body, but the husband, and likewise also the husband hath not power of his own body, but the wife." Marriags is the remedy against fornication and this is the subject of the chapter. Such is the opinion of Clark, Henry, Whitsy, Olshauson, Lauge and others. One great evil prevailed in Corinta, a community of wives, which the apostic here calls fornication. St. Paul strikes at the very root of this evil, and community, "Let every man have his own wife and let every woman have her own husband;" that is, let the man have his own peculiar, proper, appropriate whe, and the wife her own peculiar, proper, appropriate husband. In this there is mutual appropriation and exclusiveness of right. And this command of Paul agrees with the law of Moses in Levilicus xviil., is—"Netter shalt thou take one wife unto another," and the two are one statute, clear and unquestionable for monogamy and against polygamy. The aposile teaches the reciprocal duties of the husband and the wife. The exclusive right which he asserts in verse four is mutual. The force of the terms eatos (h.s.) and fatom (own) is equal. They have the force of the terms would destroy the analogy of the argument, as any other right which he asserts in verse four is mutual. The force of the terms eatos (h.s.) and fatom (own) is equal. They have the force of the terms would destroy the analogy of the argument, as any other rides would be wholly repugnisant to the assertion in verse four. In that verse it is distinctly almined by the term homotos, or "just as"—that is, "in the same sense"—that the husband can claim a whole husband; she has pust as good a right to a whole husba

bees of Capties and make them the members of the his off off capta. Which is not done in which is joined to a Barfot is one body? for twe saith he, shall be one feels. But he that is joined unto the Lord is one spirit." This passage it wastal he one feels. But he that is joined unto the Lord is one spirit." This passage it was a strain that is not to the control of the control o clude that, from the seventh commandment, from the common meaning of adultery and fornication as given by Christ, and from Job and Isaiah, that the term neaph comprehends all the modifications of that crime down to the salachi lust that a man may feel in his sout for a woman.

feel in his sout for a woman.

But it may be asked, if this is so, then "Why does the Mosaic law mention the married woman and not the unmarried woman." We dony that such a distinction was made. We do admit, however, that special pensities were denoanced against such a connection with a married woman, but for special reasons. What were those reasons. The design was to preserve the generalogy, parentage and birth of Christ from interruption and confusion, which was in imminent danger where intercourse with a married woman was had by a man other than her husband; but no such danger could arise from the intercourse of a married man with an unmarried woman. But those temporary and special laws passed away when Christ came. Under the Jewish dispensation he that collabated with a woman other than his wife was responsible to God for the violation of the seventh commandment and this special law. Now both the man and the woman are quality responsible to God for the violation of the seventh commandment and this special law. Now both the man and the woman are quality responsible to God for the violation of the seventh commandment and this special law. Now both the man and the woman are quality responsible to God for the violation of the seventh commandment.

But you say if this be true then some of the greatmen in Bible times were gaility of a violation of the seventh commandment.

But you say if this be true then some of the greatmen in Bible times were gaility of a violation of the seventh commandment.

But you say if this be true then some of the greatmen in Bible times were gaility of a violation of the seventh commandment.

But you say if this be true then some of the greatmen in Bible times were gaility of a violation of the seventh commandment.

But you say if this be true then some of the greatmen in Bible times were gaility of a violation of the seventh commandment.

But you good, I proclaim the fact that polygamy is adultery. (General outburst of dissent and loud cries of "Shame, siame! an, on!" I assert it, wit

you cannot find more than 6,000 recorded prosticiones. I can go, for instance, to St. Louis, where they have just taken the census, and the prostitutes of that city, with a population of 300,000, are but 650. You may go through the length and breadth of this land, in villages where there are from a thousand to ten thousand inhabitants, and von cannot find a house of prostitution. The truth is, my friends, if would not be allowed for a moment, and these men that assert that our monogamous country is filled, with prostitutes uter a slander upon our country.

One distinguished friend referred to religious liberty and claimed that he had a right under the federal constitution, to practice polygamy. I are as proud as he is that we have realgious liberty here, I rejoice that a man can worship food after his own heart. But I affirm that the law of institution is no less applicable to religious liberty han it is to the revolution of the heavenly bodies. The law of limitation is as universal as creation. Religious liberty must be practiced within the bounds of decency and the well being of society, and civil authority may be extended to restrict religious liberty within due bounds. The Hindoo mother may come here with her Shasta, which is her Bible, and she may throw her child into your river or take, and civil government according to your theory could not notice it nor say to that mother, "You shan't do it." You say it is a nurder i say it is not. The act is stripped of all the attributes of murder. It is a religious act. She turns to her Sible and says, "I am commanded to do the from the Shasta, and you will say that to legislate in regard to marriage, and to restrict the number of wives to one. But I am not an advocate of stringent legislation. I agree with my friend that the law should not incarcerate men, women and children in duageous. Nar, my friends, if can say a good word to laduce numane and kind